

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

Andre L. Marais BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard, 7th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025

MAILED

FEB 2 8 2006

Technology Center 2100

In re Application of: Prasad RAJE

Application No. 09/669,594 Filed: September 26, 2000

For: METHOD, APPARATUS, AND SYSTEM FOR

AUTOMATED CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROGRAMS TO PROCESS INTERNET FORM RELATED

SUBMISSIONS

DECISION ON PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.181 TO WITHDRAW HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT

This is a decision on the petition filed on December 22, 2003 under 37 CFR § 1.181(a) to withdraw the holding of abandonment of the above-identified application.

This application was held abandoned for failure to timely file a response to the Final Office Action mailed May 9, 2003. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on December 12, 2003.

Petitioner states that an Amendment After Final was in fact timely filed. To support this assertion, petitioner provides a copy of the "Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission" which acknowledges receipt by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) on July 24, 2003. The copy of Facsimile Cover Sheet did list (1) Amendment After Final and (2) Certificate of Facsimile. Petitioner also provides copy of the Amendment After Final.

The original Amendment After Final, acknowledged as having been received in the USPTO on July 23, 2003, is not of record in the application.

The copy of the original Amendment After Final is considered timely and would be a proper response if it placed the application in condition for allowance. However, such is not the case. The amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance. A proper response to a final rejection is one which places the application in condition for allowance. A Notice of Appeal, filed within the period for response is also considered a proper response. Unfortunately, neither of the above two mentioned conditions are present in this case. It is incumbent upon applicant to properly response to a final Office action. Risk of abandonment is always present when amendments are filed after final action without adequate follow-up, e.g. filing a Notice of Appeal, telephoning the Examiner, etc. The latter would not prevent abandonment but would provide applicant with the necessary information to undertake appropriate action. The delay in considering the Amendment After Final and this petition is regretted, but does not alleviate applicant's responsibility to respond within the statutory period.

Serial No.: 09/669,594 Decision on Petition

In view of the above stated reasons, the Notice of Abandonment is not vacated. The application remains abandoned in fact.

The petition is **DENIED**.

The application file is being forwarded to the Office of Petitions for treatment of the petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.137.

Any inquiry concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned whose telephone number is (571) 272-3613.

Paul Sewell, Acting Director Technology Center 2100

Philowell

Computer Architecture, Software, and

Information Security

Attachment: Advisory Action

. Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/669,594	RAJE, PRASAD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William L. Bashore	2176	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 12/22/2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reich places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The d have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•		
2. \boxtimes The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	pecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c)	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		sidered but does No	OT place the
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims v			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	: :		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>126-142</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap	proved or b)☐ disapproved by	the Examiner.	

STEPHEN S. HONG PRIMARY EXAMINER

10. Other: ____

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

Applicant's proposed amendment replacing "periodically" with "automatically", significantly changes the scope of the claimed invention when interpreted as a whole, therefore, said amendment would require further search and/or consideration..

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Holt's "Form Control Procedure" (FCP) implements user defined processing of forms (Holt column 2 lines 45-53). Since input form behaviors are generally implemented by code instructions, user customization results in automatic customization of the code constructs so as to carry out the user's alterations

The input fields of Hoit's finalized form (Figure 3) are graphical, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use said graphical depiction in the development mode (for specifying said field behavior), providing Holt th benefit of graphical depictions for previewing forms (during development).

See also Final Office Action.